

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-16 are pending in the application. The Examiner has rejected claims 1-16. Applicant has added new claims 17 and 18. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of pending claims 1-18.

The Examiner characterizes Applicant's argument as being focused on the following:

- (A) Hansen fails to teach "determining whether the local interface and next neighbor information is associated with a logical configuration link stored among a plurality of logical configuration links in a logical link database."
- (B) Hansen fails to teach "creating a new logical configuration link when the local interface and next neighbor information is not associated with any of the logical configuration links in the logical link database and storing the new logical configuration link in the logical link database."
- (C) Hansen fails to teach "selecting a link numbering type for the new logical configuration link."

The Examiner disagrees. With respect to the Examiner's characterization (A) above, the Examiner states, "Hansen teaches this limitation because it identifies the location of the configuration file, and the location could be on a local drive or on a network neighborhood. (see Hansen, column 5, lines 45-65) By doing that, Hansen determines whether the logical configuration links to a local database or a network database."

Applicant respectfully disagrees. Applicant notes the Examiner asserts the teachings of Hansen disjunctively identify a location of a configuration file as being either on a local drive or on a network neighborhood. However, Applicant notes "determining whether the local interface and next neighbor information" is recited conjunctively. Therefore, Applicant submits the purported teachings alleged by the Examiner with respect to the Examiner's characterization (A) above fail to disclose the subject matter recited in the claims.

With respect to the Examiner's characterization (B) above, the Examiner states, "Hansen teaches this limitation because the PCI slot 3, which is not connected or associated with any logical

configure, can be configured to be linked to a network device and configured according to device's information. (see Hansen, column 15, lines 40-60) By doing so, Hansen creates a new logical configuration on the PCI slot 3 when none existed before." The Examiner further states, "Hansen stores the new configured script in a memory subsystem, and the memory subsystem is a database for configuration scripts. (see Hansen, column 2, lines 40-45)." The Examiner also clarified confusion over the Examiner's statements concerning two different cited patents (U.S. Patents 6,772,204 and 5,838,907) issued to inventors named Hansen.

Applicant respectfully disagrees. While the Examiner asserted the teachings of Hansen disjunctively identified a location of a configuration file as being either on a local drive or on a network neighborhood, such assertion of the purported teachings of Hansen also implies that Hansen fails to disclose "creating a new logical configuration link when the local interface and next neighbor information is not associated with any of the logical configuration links in the logical link database...." Thus, Applicant submits the rejections based on the purported teachings alleged by the Examiner with respect to the Examiner's characterization (B) cannot properly be maintained.

With respect to the Examiner's characterization (C) above, the Examiner states, "Hansen teaches this limitation because the new PCI is configured with desired port number and port setting. The selection of port number and setting is a selection of number link configuration. (see Hansen, col. 15, lines 40-45)."

Applicant respectfully disagrees. Applicant notes "Hansen [understood to refer to U.S. Patent 5,838,907], col. 15, lines 40-45)" states, "Specifically, for the Compaq router 122, PCI slot 1 has been used to provide a first ethernet connection 222, PCI slot 2, an HSSI connection 224 and PCI slot 4, a second ethernet 226. PCI slot 3, however, remains unconnected. From the backplane bitmap 220, the network administrator may view the settings for a port by double clicking on a selected port...." Applicant does not see the purported teaching of "the new PCI is configured with desired port number and port setting" in the cited portion of the cited reference. Thus, Applicant submits the rejections based on the purported teachings alleged by the Examiner with respect to the Examiner's characterization (C) cannot properly be maintained.

Applicant notes Applicant has also presented arguments as to the Hansen reference failing to disclose "an unnumbered type," modifying a logical configuration link in the logical link database,"

"deleting a logical configuration link in the logical link database," "a processing system coupled to the logical link database for accessing the logical link database," "...wherein the processing system determines local interface and next neighbor information for the network device," "...wherein the processing system determines whether the local interface and next neighbor information is associated with one of the logical configuration links stored in the logical link database," "...wherein the processing system creates a new logical configuration link when the local interface and next neighbor information is not associated with any of the logical configuration links stored in the logical link database," "...wherein the processing system causes the new logical configuration link to be stored in the logical link database," "...wherein the processing system validates the new logical configuration link," and "...wherein the processing system causes the new logical configuration link to be sent to the network device." With respect to claims 5 and 6, Applicant has further presented arguments regarding the allowability of claims 5 and 6. However, the Examiner appears to have limited the Examiner's Response to Arguments to the Examiner's characterizations (A), (B), and (C), but does not appear to have responded to the Applicant's other previously presented arguments, as noted above. Thus, Applicant continues to contend that claims for which such arguments have been advanced are in condition for allowance.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-4 and 7-16 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Hansen (United States Patent No. 5,838,907). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Regarding claim 1, Applicant has presented arguments for the allowability of claim 1 above in response to the Examiner's Response to Arguments. Therefore, Applicant submits claim 1 is in condition for allowance.

Regarding claim 2, Applicant has presented arguments for the allowability of claim 2 above in response to the Examiner's Response to Arguments. Therefore, Applicant submits claim 2 is in condition for allowance.

Regarding claim 3, Applicant has presented arguments for the allowability of claim 3 above in response to the Examiner's Response to Arguments. Thus, Applicant submits claim 3 is also in condition for allowance.

Regarding claim 4, Applicant has presented arguments for the allowability of claim 4 above in response to the Examiner's Response to Arguments. Therefore, Applicant submits claim 4 is in condition for allowance.

Regarding claim 7, Applicant has presented arguments for the allowability of claim 7 above in response to the Examiner's Response to Arguments. Thus, Applicant submits claim 7 is in condition for allowance.

Regarding claim 8, Applicant has presented arguments for the allowability of claim 8 above in response to the Examiner's Response to Arguments. Thus, Applicant submits claim 8 is in condition for allowance.

Regarding claim 9, Applicant has presented arguments for the allowability of claim 9 above in response to the Examiner's Response to Arguments. Thus, Applicant submits claim 9 is in condition for allowance.

Regarding claim 10, Applicant has presented arguments for the allowability of claim 10 above in response to the Examiner's Response to Arguments. Thus, Applicant submits claim 10 is also in condition for allowance.

Regarding claim 11, Applicant has presented arguments for the allowability of claim 11 above in response to the Examiner's Response to Arguments. Thus, Applicant submits claim 11 is in condition for allowance.

Regarding claim 12, Applicant has presented arguments for the allowability of claim 12 above in response to the Examiner's Response to Arguments. Thus, Applicant submits claim 12 is in condition for allowance.

Regarding claim 13, Applicant has presented arguments for the allowability of claim 13 above in response to the Examiner's Response to Arguments. Therefore, Applicant submits claim 13 is in condition for allowance.

Regarding claim 14, Applicant has presented arguments for the allowability of claim 14 above in response to the Examiner's Response to Arguments. Therefore, Applicant submits claim 14 is in condition for allowance.

Regarding claim 15, Applicant has presented arguments for the allowability of claim 15 above in response to the Examiner's Response to Arguments. Therefore, Applicant submits claim 15 is in condition for allowance.

Regarding claim 16, Applicant has presented arguments for the allowability of claim 16 above in response to the Examiner's Response to Arguments. Therefore, Applicant submits claim 16 is in condition for allowance.

The Examiner has rejected claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Hansen in view of Hansen (United States Patent No. 5,838,907), and further in view of Hardwick (United States Patent No. 5,550,816). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Regarding claim 5, Applicant has presented arguments for the allowability of claim 5 above in response to the Examiner's Response to Arguments. Thus, Applicant submits claim 5 is in condition for allowance.

The Examiner has rejected claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Hansen (United States Patent No. 5,838,907) in view of Chui (United States Patent No. 2002/0165978). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Regarding claim 6, Applicant has presented arguments for the allowability of claim 6 above in response to the Examiner's Response to Arguments. Thus, Applicant submits claim 6 is in condition for allowance.

In conclusion, Applicant has overcome all of the Office's rejections, and early notice of allowance to this effect is earnestly solicited. If, for any reason, the Office is unable to allow the Application on the next Office Action, and believes a telephone interview would be helpful, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

01/24/2008  
Date



Ross D. Snyder, Reg. No. 37,730  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Ross D. Snyder & Associates, Inc.  
PO Box 164075  
Austin, Texas 78716-4075  
(512) 347-9223 (phone)  
(512) 347-9224 (fax)